

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-8 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 2, 4 and 9-18 was previously cancelled.

In the Final Office Action dated May 15, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 5-8.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 were amended and claim 7 was cancelled. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sonoda, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0028389) in view of Okamoto et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003 0027050). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 requires a battery that includes an electrolyte that is made up of contains an anion expressed by Chemical formula 1, an anion selected from the group consisting of PF_6^- , BF_4^- , ClO_4^- and AsF_6^- , an anion expressed by Chemical formula 2, and (4) an anion expressed by Chemical formula 4. As required by the claims, Chemical formula 4 is represented by the formula, $[\text{C}(\text{C}_p\text{F}_{2p+1}\text{SO}_2)(\text{C}_q\text{F}_{2q+1}\text{SO}_2)(\text{C}_r\text{F}_{2r+1}\text{SO}_2)]^-$ where p, q, and r are integer numbers of 1 or more.

Sonoda et al. teaches a non-aqueous electrolyte that includes anions represented by the formula $\text{MBR}^1\text{R}^2\text{R}^3\text{R}^4$ and $\text{N}(\text{CF}_3\text{SO}_2)_2^-$. Sonoda et al., paragraphs [0010-0011], [0068]. However, Sonoda et al. does not teach or even fairly suggest that the electrolyte includes an anion represented by the Chemical formula 4 $[\text{C}(\text{C}_p\text{F}_{2p+1}\text{SO}_2)(\text{C}_q\text{F}_{2q+1}\text{SO}_2)(\text{C}_r\text{F}_{2r+1}\text{SO}_2)]^-$, where p, q, and r are integer numbers of 1 or more as required by the claims.

Okamoto et al. teaches a thin film of active material on the current collector, however like Sonoda et al., Okamoto et al. also fails to teach or even fairly suggest the anion represented by Chemical formula 4. As such, the cited references fail to teach or even fairly suggest all the requirements of the claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 6 and 8 are patentable over the cited references. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the above rejection be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

| Dated: July 13, 2009

By: /Anne K. Wasilchuk/
Anne K. Wasilchuk
Registration No. 59,592
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000